

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

COREY LAMONT LANIER,

Petitioner,

v.

Criminal Case Number 11-00098

Civil Case Number 16-01526

Honorable David M. Lawson

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

_____ /

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE RECORD

This matter is before the Court on the petitioner's motion for clarification of the record regarding the Court's grant of the government's request to extend the time for filing a response to the amended petition, which was filed on November 15, 2017. The Court has reviewed the motion and notes that it consists in principal part of objections to the extension of the briefing schedule. However, the detailed recital of the procedural history of the case set forth in the motion shows that the petitioner well understands the nature and import of the Court's previous orders, and, therefore, no clarification of the record is needed.

As to the petitioner's opposition to the motion to extend time, the Court finds that he has not shown good cause to deny the request for an extension of the briefing schedule that the government requested. The petitioner contends that the filing of a motion to extend time by the government's attorney Jimmie Ramsaur was improper in this case, because his appearance was terminated on September 20, 2016. The record does indicate that attorney Ramsaur's original appearance was terminated on that date, and that attorney Sunny Koshy then continued to represent the government. However, on November 30, 2017, attorney Ramsaur filed a renewed notice of appearance as counsel of record for the government, before he filed the government's recent motion to extend the briefing

schedule. There was, therefore, nothing improper about the filing of that motion by attorney Ramsaur, and the petitioner has not offered any other good reason why the motion to extend time should have been denied, particularly where the need for extra time was precipitated by the Court's indulgence of the petitioner's recent prayer for leave to file an amended petition, which spans 86 pages and raises numerous issues that were not presented in the original petition, which was filed by previously appointed appellate counsel (whose appointment since has been dismissed, at the petitioner's request).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the petitioner's motion for clarification of the record [35] is **DENIED**.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge
Sitting by special designation

Dated: January 16, 2018